Peer Review Report

Review Report on Temporal dynamics of socioeconomic inequalities in COVID-19 outcomes over the course of the pandemic – A scoping review.

Review, Int J Public Health

Reviewer: Daniel Ludecke
Submitted on: 18 Jul 2022
Article DOI: 10.3389/ijph.2022.1605128

EVALUATION

Q 1 Please summarize the main theme of the review.

The present study is a scoping review of research about socioeconomic inequalities related to COVID-19 associated health impairment. In particular, this review investigates whether disparities between populations with lower compared to higher SES are temporarily more pronounced due to the impact of the pandemic. One aim of the study was to gain better understanding the dynamic of patterns of health inequalities in the course of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Q 2 Please highlight the limitations and strengths.

Strength: The planning and implementation of the scoping review is very rigor and sophisticated. Detailed information is provided. Based on the study results, the mechanisms of temporal dynamics could be well described and explained.

Limitations: Due to the missing quality-assessment of included studies, it remains unclear how robust the evidence of study results actually is.

Q 3 Please provide your detailed review report to the authors, structured in major and minor comments.

This is a well-written review, which provided rich information about the methodological approach and explains very well the mechanism behind temporal dynamics of social inequalities related to COVID-19. I have only a few minor comments.

Minor comments:

– The authors limit their focus / research question to high-income-countries. However, it remains unclear why the authors do so. Please provide a rational or some more details (e.g. in the introduction) why you focus on high-income-countries. One reason is provided later in the discussion, but should be made clear to the readers earlier as well.

– Figure 2 and 3 could be made clearer by adding axis labels (e.g. "Pattern" for the y- and "Outcome" or "SES-Outcome" for the x-axis). Furthermore, categories are sorted in an (inverse) alphabetically order. For the y-axis, this order seems reasonable, but for the x-axis, it might make more sense to first have the SES-outcomes measured with one indicator, and having the "index" as last (or first) category.

– In the discussion, some more details could be provided about the association of measured study outcomes with measures that relate to pandemic preparedness. In other words, did most of the studies provide explanations or recommendations related to pandemic preparedness?

PLEASE COMMENT

Q 4   Does the reference list cover the relevant literature adequately and in an unbiased manner?

Yes.

Q 5   Does this manuscript refer only to published data? (unpublished data is not allowed for Reviews)

Yes.

Q 6   Does the manuscript cover the issue in an objective and analytical manner

Yes.

Q 7   Was a review on the issue published in the past 12 months?

No.

Q 8   Does the review have international or global implications?

Yes.

Q 9   Is the title appropriate, concise, attractive?

Yes.

Q 10   Are the keywords appropriate?

Yes.

Q 11   Is the English language of sufficient quality?

Yes.

Q 12   Is the quality of the figures and tables satisfactory?

Yes.

QUALITY ASSESSMENT

		Rating
Q 13	Quality of generalization and summary	4/5
Q 14	Significance to the field	5/5
Q 15	Interest to a general audience	4/5
Q 16	Quality of the writing	4/5

REVISION LEVEL

Q 17 **Please take a decision based on your comments:**

Minor revisions.